

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SPECIAL MEETING
Thursday, March 27, 2008 – 1:00 p.m. MDT
Len B. Jordan Building
650 W. State Street
3rd Floor Conference Room, Clear Waters
Boise, Idaho



Teleconference Number: 1-888-422-7124
Participant Code: 848445

Thursday, March 27, 2008 – 1:00 p.m. MDT

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

1. 1st Reading – Policy Section I.M.4. and Section III.M.3.
2. Preliminary Draft Strategic Plan
3. Board Self-Evaluation Review

OTHER / NEW BUSINESS

While the Board attempts to address items in the listed order, some items may be addressed by the Board prior to or after the order listed.

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	1ST READING – POLICY SECTION I.M.4. AND SECTION III.M.3.	Motion to Approve
2	PRELIMINARY DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN	Information Item
3	BOARD SELF-EVALUATION REVIEW	Information Item

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

SUBJECT

1st Reading – Board Policy Sections I.M.4. and III.M.3.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.A.5.b.

BACKGROUND

The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) is an independent, non-profit membership organization recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) as the regional authority on educational quality and institutional effectiveness of higher education institutions in the seven-state Northwest region of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington. It fulfills its mission by establishing accreditation criteria and evaluation procedures by which institutions are reviewed.

The Commission oversees regional accreditation for 160 institutions. Its decision-making body consists of up to twenty-six Commissioners who represent the public and the diversity of higher education institutions within the Northwest region.

Institutions accredited by the NWCCU are required to examine their own missions, goals, operations, and achievements. The NWCCU then provides analysis by peer evaluators and recommendations for improvement from the accrediting body. The accreditation status of an institution is reviewed every ten years. In addition, each institution is to prepare an interim report and be visited by one or more representatives of the Commission at five year intervals between decennial visits.

NWCCU makes accreditation decisions in part on their nine set standards. Standard 6.B.6 states that the board regularly evaluates its performance and revises, as necessary, its policies to demonstrate to its constituencies that it carries out its responsibilities in an effective and efficient manner.

DISCUSSION

Approval of the proposed policies will improve the boards ability to function efficiently and better meet the needs of the institutions as they participate in the accreditation process.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Policies & Procedures, Section I.M.

Page 3

Attachment 2 – Policies & Procedures, Section III.M.

Page 5

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends approval of Board policy, section I.M.4. and section III.M.3.

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

BOARD ACTION

A motion to approve the 1st reading of the Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.M.4.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

And

A motion to approve the 1st reading of the Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.M.3.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

Idaho State Board of Education

GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SECTION: I. GENERAL GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SUBSECTION: M. Annual Planning and Reporting

August 2006-March 2008

M. Annual Planning and Reporting

1. Strategic Plans

- a. Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College, University of Idaho, North Idaho College, College of Southern Idaho, Eastern Idaho Technical College, Division of Professional-Technical Education, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Idaho Educational Public Broadcasting System, and the School for the Deaf and the Blind will develop and maintain five-year strategic plans.

(1) Institution, school and agency strategic plans shall be aligned with the Board's strategic plan, be created in accordance with Board guidelines, and be consistent with assigned role and mission statements.

(2) Plans shall be updated annually and submitted to the Board for approval.

(3) Plans shall be submitted by the Board to the appropriate state administrative entity in order to meet the state's annual planning requirements.

- b. The Idaho State Historical Society and Idaho Commission for Libraries are recognized as unique collaborators in the state education system and are encouraged to report annually to the Board in accordance with these guidelines.

c. Format

Plans submitted to the Board annually should be as concise as possible and in accordance with a schedule and format established by the executive director.

Plans should contain:

(1) A comprehensive mission and vision statement covering the major programs, functions and activities of the organization.

(2) General goals and objectives for the major programs, functions and activities of the organization, including a description of how they are to be achieved.

- (a) Institutions (including Professional-Technical Education) and the School for the Deaf and the Blind should address, at a minimum, instructional issues (including accreditation and student issues), infrastructure issues (including personnel, finance, and facilities), advancement (including foundation activities), and the external environment served by the institution.

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

- (b) Agencies should address, at a minimum, constituent issues and service delivery, infrastructure issues (including personnel, finance, and facilities), and advancement (if applicable).
- (3) Identification of key factors external to the organization that could significantly affect the achievement of the general goals and objectives.
- (4) A brief description of the evaluations or processes to be used in establishing or revising general goals and objectives in the future.

2. Performance Measures

Performance measures will be developed in conjunction with the Board's planning process and will be updated annually for Board approval. Performance measures will be used to measure results, ensure accountability, and encourage continuous improvement to meet goals and objectives.

- a. Postsecondary institutions will develop a set of uniform performance measures that will gauge progress in such areas as enrollment, retention, and graduation.
- b. Each institution, agency and the school will develop unique measures tied to its strategic plan.

3. Progress Reports

Progress reports that include, but are not limited to, progress on the approved strategic plan, details of implementation, status of goals and objectives, and expanded information on points of interest and special appropriations will be provided to the Board at least once annually in accordance with a schedule and format established by the executive director.

4. Self-Evaluation

Each year, the Board will conduct a self-evaluation in conjunction with annual strategic planning activities. The self-evaluation methodology will include a staff analysis of all institution, agency and school annual performance reporting, and comments and suggestions solicited from Board constituency groups to include the Governor, the Legislature, agency heads, institution presidents and other stakeholders identified by the Board President. The Executive Committee of the Board will annually develop a tailored Board self-evaluation questionnaire for use by individual Board members and the Board collectively to evaluate their own performance. Annually, in conjunction with a regular or special meeting, the Board will discuss the key issues identified in the institution, agency and school performance reporting assessment, comments and suggestions received from constituency groups, and the self-evaluation questionnaire in order to further refine Board strategic goals, objectives and strategies for continuous improvement of Board governance and oversight. Self-evaluation results will be shared with constituent groups and should heavily influence strategic plan development.

Idaho State Board of Education
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS
M. Accreditation

~~April 2002~~ March 2008

M. Accreditation

1. Recognized Accrediting Agencies

The State Board of Education only recognizes accreditation by the six (6) regional accrediting associations and those national accrediting associations which are recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. The six (6) regional accrediting associations are:

Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools
New England Association of Schools and Colleges
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

2. Recognition as Accredited Institution

Any institution that wishes to be recognized as an accredited institution must submit to the Executive Director at least ten (10) days prior to a regularly scheduled Board meeting documentation showing its accreditation status with an accrediting organization recognized by the Board. The Executive Director is responsible for verifying the institution's submission and making a recommendation to the Board.

3. Institutional Reports

~~A copy of the self-study completed by an institution under governance of the Board will be submitted to the Office of the State Board of Education upon request. A copy of the final report and recommendations from the accrediting agency must be submitted by the institution to the Office of the State Board of Education for review prior to institutional submission to the Board. The Board's Executive Director or his or her designee will be the Board's representative during all accreditation studies.~~

~~The chief executive officer of the institution will inform the Office of the State Board annually, through the Executive Director, of any impending accreditation reviews.~~

Institutions under the governance of the Board shall update the Board as to the content and status of their self evaluation and provide the Board with opportunities to participate in the process as appropriate. A copy of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) accreditation self-study completed by an institution under the governance of the Board shall be submitted to the Board's Executive Director at the same time the report is forwarded to the NWCCU. Prior to a formal NWCCU

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

accreditation visitation to an institution (5 year and 10 year visits), the institution president will notify the Board's Executive Director of such visit and schedule a time and place for Board representation during the visit. At a minimum, the Board's Executive Director (or designee) and three Board members shall visit the NWCCU self-study team during each ten year visitation to an institution. Board member participation for the five year visits will be determined by the Board's Executive Director upon consultation with the NWCCU review team. A copy of each corrective action progress report submitted to NWCCU by an institution will also be forwarded to the Board's Executive Director at the same time the report is sent to the NWCCU.

Idaho State Board of Education

GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SECTION: I. GENERAL GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SUBSECTION: A. Policy Making Authority

August 2006

5. Adoption, Amendment, or Repeal of Board Policies

- a. Board policies may be adopted by majority vote at any regular or special meeting of the Board. The adoption, amendment, or repeal of a Board policy may be requested by any member of the Board, the executive director, or any chief executive officer. Persons who are Board employees, or students or student groups, must file a written request with the chief executive officer of an institution, agency or school, or his or her designee, to receive Board consideration. An Idaho resident, other than those described above, may file a written request with the executive director for Board consideration of a proposal. Regardless of the source, a statement of the proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal must be presented to the executive director for transmittal to the Board. If the subject matter of the presentation concerns an agency, institution, school, or department of the Board, the executive director will also notify the appropriate chief executive officer of the nature of the request.
- b. Board action on any proposal will not be taken earlier than the next regular or special meeting following Board approval for first reading. During the interim between the first reading and Board action, the chief executive officers will seek to discuss and review the proposal with faculty, staff, or other Board employees and students or student groups, as appropriate. The chief executive officers will transmit summaries of oral statements and written comments on the proposal to the executive director. After thorough consideration, the proposal will be presented by the executive director to the Board for action.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

SUBJECT

Preliminary review of the Idaho State Board of Education Strategic Plan

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.M.1.
Section 67-1903, Idaho Code.

BACKGROUND

The State of Idaho requires the Board to submit a plan by July. The Board completed a revised plan last August, but it did not meet the parameters set by the Governor's office.

DISCUSSION

The draft plan presented is developed from past Board goals and objectives. It also includes performance measures and benchmarks for each objective. These measures have been a part of the general educational discussion, but have not been individually vetted by the schools, agencies or institutions. This plan also does not contain the "Relevance Goal" contained in past Board plans. After developing and editing the plan, the only objective left under "Relevance" fit better under the "Quality" goal.

The intention is to have this plan reviewed by the institutions, agencies and the Board and approved at the April Board meeting. Institutions and agencies can then use the Board plan to assist in finalizing their individual strategic plans, which are also due in July. The Board can also use their goals and objectives as a guide for approving the FY09 budget request.

In addition to the strategic plan itself, a planning calendar has also been developed which combines the strategic planning process, performance reporting process, the eight-year academic program plan and the legislation development process. Timing is designed to meet the state requirements, the availability of data, and the need to provide timely Board guidance and direction to institutions and agencies.

IMPACT

This plan will help direct the Board's effort during the next fiscal year as well as provide guidance and direction for establishing the budget.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Draft Strategic Plan

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Board review and provide input to both the plan and calendar.

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

BOARD ACTION

This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.

**Idaho State Board of Education Strategic Plan
2009-2013**

Vision:

The State Board of Education envisions an accessible, seamless public education system that provides for an intelligent and well-informed citizenry, contributes to the overall economy, and improves the general quality of life in Idaho.

Mission:

The Idaho educational system, consisting of the unique agencies and institutions governed by the Board, as well as the school districts and charter schools, delivers public primary, secondary and postsecondary education, training, rehabilitation, and information/research services throughout the state. These agencies, institutions and public schools collaborate to provide educational programs and services that are high quality, readily accessible, relevant to the needs of the state and delivered in the most efficient manner to a geographically and diverse landscape. In recognition that good jobs promote economic growth, social mobility, social justice, and help sustain the country's democratic ideals, the State Board of Education endeavors to ensure more people achieve higher levels of education, and are well prepared to enter the workplace.

Authority and Scope:

The Idaho Constitution provides that the general supervision of the state educational institutions and public school system of the State of Idaho shall be vested in a state board of education. Pursuant to Idaho Code, the State Board of Education is charged to provide the general governance of all state education institutions, to define the limits of all instruction in the educational institutions supported in whole or in part by the state, and as far as practicable, prevent wasteful duplication of effort in said institutions. In addition, all public schools are under the supervision of the State Board of Education.

**State Board of Education Governed
Agencies and Institutions:**

Educational Institutions	Agencies
Idaho Public School System	State Department of Education
Idaho State University	Division of Professional-Technical Education
University of Idaho	Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Boise State University	School for the Deaf and the Blind
Lewis-Clark State College	Office of the State Board of Education
Eastern Idaho Technical College	Idaho Public Broadcasting System
College of Southern Idaho*	Idaho State Historical Society**
College of Northern Idaho*	Idaho State Library**
College of Western Idaho*	
*Also have separate elected oversight boards	**Also have separate oversight boards appointed by the State Board of Education

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

Goal I: Quality – Sustain and continuously improve the quality of Idaho’s public education, training, rehabilitation, and information/research programs and services.

Objectives for quality:

1. Continue developing a career continuum and compensation system for all teachers, faculty, and staff that rewards knowledge, skills and productivity; and promotes recruiting, hiring, and retention.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - Board governed agency and institution personnel total compensation as a percent of regional peer organizations.
 - *Benchmark:*
 - Teachers, faculty, and staff should enjoy good working conditions and be compensated at levels comparable (90-100 percent) to peer regional public and private organizations (normalized by the Consumer Price Index and location).
2. Strive for continuous improvement and increased level of public confidence in the education system through performance-based assessments and accountability, and careful monitoring of accreditation processes.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - *The number of schools and districts meeting or exceeding Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year.*
 - *Benchmark:*
 - Number of schools and districts meeting or exceeding AYP each year to 100% by 2013.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - *Schools, institutions, and agencies accreditation results.*
 - *Benchmark:*
 - Schools, institutions, and agencies meet or exceed accreditation standards.
3. Increase the availability of highly qualified teachers, especially in high need areas.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - *Number of Idaho teachers who are certified each year by specialty.*
 - *Benchmark:*
 - Numbers of certified teachers are adequate to meet demand.

**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008**

4. Foster an academic environment that encourages and enables cooperative (public/private partnerships) efforts to engage in relevant research.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - External funding for research per faculty FTE.
 - *Benchmark:*
 - *External funding for research per faculty FTE is equivalent to peer institutions.*
5. Improve the service delivery model for infants, toddlers, children, and youth who are blind, visually impaired, deaf, or hard of hearing, including those with additional disabilities or deafblindness.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - Satisfaction of parents of infants, toddlers, children, and youth who are blind, visually impaired, deaf, or hard of hearing, including those with additional disabilities or deafblindness.
 - *Benchmark:*
 - The number of parents of infants, toddlers, children, and youth satisfied with services in the state will be at least 90%.

Goal II: Access – Continuously improve access for individuals of all ages, abilities, and economic means to the public education system, training, rehabilitation, and information/research programs and services.

Objectives for access:

1. Increase participation of secondary students in advanced opportunities programs for receiving postsecondary credits (Advanced Placement Courses, dual credit, Tech-Prep, and International Baccalaureate).
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - *Number of schools/districts offering advanced opportunities in each program and the total number of students enrolled in each program.*
 - *Benchmark:*
 - One hundred percent of secondary schools offer advanced opportunities.
 - Students enrolled in advanced opportunities programs will increase to an appropriate percentage.
2. Maintain and increase high school graduation rates, especially for minority students.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - Percentage of 9th grade students graduating from high school.
 - *Benchmark:*
 - Increase the percentage of 9th grade students graduating from high school.

**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008**

3. Increase student access to educational opportunities by reducing barriers to efficient transfer of credit and student status.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - Number of transfer students, average number of credit hours requested for transfer, average number of credit hours (as a percent total requested) accepted for transfer, brief list of general reasons for non-transfer decisions by the institution.
 - *Benchmark:*
 - *At least 80% of credits requested will transfer for students (with two or less years of postsecondary education) when transferring from one of Idaho's regionally accredited postsecondary institutions to another Idaho regionally accredited postsecondary institution.*
4. Increase access to postsecondary education by improving students' ability to pay for educational costs.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - *The percent of educational costs covered by non-loan based financial aid.*
 - *Benchmark:*
 - The percent of expenses paid by non-loan based financial aid will increase to a level equivalent with peer institutions.
5. Improve the rate of high school graduates advancing to postsecondary education.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - *Number of high school graduates (as a percent of total graduates) advancing to postsecondary education within two years of graduation.*
 - *Benchmark:*
 - At least 50% of high school graduates will register as full-time or part-time postsecondary students within two years of graduating high school.
6. Increase student access to relevant medical education programs (nursing, physician assistant, health technicians, and physicians).
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - *Number of nurses, physician assistants, and physicians per 100K of Idaho's population.*
 - *Benchmark:*
 - *Number of nurses, physician assistants, and physicians (per 100K of Idaho's general population) will increase each year until comparing favorably with other states in the Northwest.*

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

Goal III: Efficiency – Deliver educational, training, rehabilitation and information/research programs and services through the public education system in a manner which makes effective and efficient use of resources.

Objectives for efficiency:

1. Improve the quality and efficiency of data collection and reporting for informed decision-making.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - *Adequacy and scope of data collection systems.*
 - *Benchmark:*
 - Number of systems developed and implemented.
2. Improve the postsecondary program completion rate.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - Number of full-time, first-time students from the cohort of new first year students who enroll for the second year (or reach program completion in the professional technical programs).
 - *Benchmark:*
 - Number of first year students who enroll for the second year will be equivalent to the top 30% of the institutions' peers.
3. Develop the most efficient and cost effective delivery system for adequately meeting the needs of infants, toddlers, children, and youth who are blind, visually impaired, deaf, or hard of hearing, including those with additional disabilities or deafblindness.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - Cost, proximity, and adequacy of services provided.
 - *Benchmark:*
 - Services meet delivery standards and are efficient compared to similar delivery services in other states.
4. Improve the use of postsecondary educational resources.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - The program cost per credit hour.
 - *Benchmark:*
 - Cost per credit hour will be consistent with institutional best practices.
5. Improve Board of Education policy pertaining to higher education tuition waivers to ensure the most efficient use of educational resources.
 - *Performance Measure:*
 - Enrollment as a percentage of capacity.
 - *Benchmark:*
 - Use of tuition waivers will maximize use of institutional resources.

Key External Factors

(beyond control of the State Board of Education):

Funding:

Most State Board of Education strategic goals and objectives assume on-going and sometimes significant additional levels of State legislative appropriations. Availability of state revenues (for appropriation), gubernatorial, and legislative support for some Board initiatives can be uncertain.

Legislation/Rules:

Beyond funding considerations, many education policies are embedded in state statute or rule and not under Board control. Changes to statute and rule desired by the Board of Education are accomplished according to state guidelines. Rules require public notice and opportunity for comment, gubernatorial support, and adoption by the Legislature. Proposed legislation must be supported by the Governor, gain approval in the germane legislative committees and pass both houses of the Legislature.

Private Schools:

The Board of Education does not provide oversight of private schools in Idaho (postsecondary, K-12, proprietary schools).

School Boards:

The Board of Education establishes rules and standards for all Idaho public K-12 education, but Idaho provides for "local control of school districts." Elected school boards have wide discretion in hiring teachers and staff, school construction and maintenance, and the daily operations of the public schools.

Federal Government:

A great deal of educational funding for Idaho public schools is provided by the federal government. Funding is often tied to specific federal programs and objectives, and therefore can greatly influence education policy in the State.

**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008**

CY2008 Strategic Planning/Performance Reporting /Budgeting Worksheet

<u>Month</u>	<u>Strategic Planning</u>	<u>Performance Reporting</u>	<u>Eight-year Academic Programs Plan (semi-annual cycle)</u>	<u>Budgeting</u>	<u>Proposed Legislation</u>
Jan		-The SBOE reviews NWCCU accreditation results as available.	-Higher Education institutions hold regional meetings and begin drafting a regional plan for academic and professional-technical program offerings over the next 8 years.		
Feb			- Institutions continue to cooperatively draft regional plans.		
Mar	- <u>Special</u> SBOE strategic planning meeting to review legislative requirement, previous Board plans, and set course for the current planning cycle. At this time the SBOE will conduct a self-evaluation of its own performance and revise, as necessary, its policies to ensure the SBOE continues to operate in an effective and efficient manner. In <u>late-March</u> SBOE/OSBE provides <u>strategic planning guidance</u> to the agencies and institutions. -Agencies and institutions start updating (and reformatting, if required) their strategic plans.	-As part of the strategic planning <u>special</u> meeting, SBOE reviews previously used performance measures and benchmarks providing guidance for the current reporting cycle. -In <u>late-March</u> SBOE/OSBE provides performance <u>measure/reporting guidance</u> to the agencies and institutions.	-Institutions (all regions) meet to conduct a statewide needs assessment for academic and professional-technical program offerings over the next 8 years.		
Apr	-SBOE is briefed on next FY legislative appropriations and new legislation as it	- <u>Early-April</u> agencies and institutions submit <u>proposed</u> performance measures/benchmarks	-Institutions share their respective draft 8 year plans	-SBOE is briefed on next FY legislative appropriations and new legislation as it	

**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008**

	impacts SBOE governed agencies and institutions. -SBOE reviews and approves SBOE strategic plan (revised format and a new year added). -SBOE receives final DFM strategic plan guidance (for governed agencies and institutions).	(including continued use of current measures, if appropriate) for review/approval by SBOE. -SBOE/OSBE receives final DFM performance reporting guidance (for governed agencies and institutions). -SBOE reviews and approves agency and institution <u>proposed</u> performance measures and benchmarks.	with OSBE and the other institutions.	impacts SBOE governed agencies and institutions. -SBOE provides <u>budget guidelines</u> (including <u>line items</u>) to the agencies and institutions.	
May	-Presidents and agency head evaluations and review of institution/agency performance, strategic plan development and goals for next four years. -Agencies and Institutions continue updating their strategic plans for submission to the SBOE prior to June agenda cutoff.	-Agencies begin collecting performance data (state fiscal year) for inclusion in their FY 2008 performance report.		-Agencies and institutions submit estimated <u>line items</u> to OSBE prior to June Board agenda cutoff.	-Agencies and institutions notified to submit legislative ideas and suggestions to OSBE prior to June Board agenda cutoff.
Jun	-SBOE reviews and approves updated agency and institution strategic plans.	-OSBE reviews and approves agency and institution performance measures.	-Institutions meet to formally present their 8 year plans.	-SBOE provides <u>budget MCO guidelines</u> to the agencies and institutions. -OSBE provides guidelines and budget template to agencies and institutions for MCO submission (prior to August Board agenda cutoff). -SBOE reviews agency and institution <u>line item</u> requests.	-SBOE reviews, approves and provides guidance concerning <u>proposed</u> agency and institution legislative ideas.
Jul	-OSBE submits SBOE approved agency and institution strategic plans (revised if required by the Board) to DFM by the early-July deadline.	-The SBOE reviews NWCCU accreditation results as available.	-Institutions meet to coordinate and finalize their 8 year plans for presentation to the Board in August . -OSBE staff verifies 8 year plans are compatible with institution role and mission,	-Agencies and institutions submit estimated MCO to OSBE prior to August Board agenda cutoff.	

**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008**

			SBOE strategic plan and performance reporting.		
Aug		-Agencies and institutions submit revised (if required) agency and institution performance reports to OSBE in <u>late-August</u> .	-Final 8 year plan for academic and professional-technical program offerings presented to the Board for approval.	-SBOE reviews and approves final budget request for next FY. -Draft budget request input to DFM automated system (by agencies and institutions) with a copy of supporting materials sent to OSBE. -OSBE reviews agency and institution budget submissions to ensure compliance with SBOE guidance. -In <u>late-August</u> all budget documents returned to OSBE for final submission to DFM and LSO.	-OSBE submits legislative ideas to DFM prior to the required <u>early-August</u> deadline. -Governor's Office and DFM review legislative ideas. -OSBE begins development of approved legislative ideas into draft legislation (as appropriate).
Sep	SBOE conducts a self-assessment.	-OSBE submits approved agency and institution performance reports to DFM by the required <u>early-September</u> deadline.		-Final budget requests forwarded to DFM and LSO by the <u>early-September</u> deadline.	-Proposed (final draft) legislation is due to DFM about <u>mid-September</u> .
Oct	-SBOE review Board's draft strategic plan. -SBOE reviews self-assessment and makes recommendations for improvements.	-SBOE reviews previous year performance data from institutions and agencies. -Performance review forms the basis for revising the strategic plan.		-SBOE strategic planning summit includes financial outlook and impact of the zero-based budgeting initiative.	-Proposed legislation is approved by the SBOE. DFM forwards to LSO by <u>mid-October</u> .
Nov	-Staff develops and finalizes (in collaboration with the agencies and institutions) the next annual update to the strategic plan.	-OSBE updates performance measures to align with the Board's strategic plan.			-Proposed legislation in <u>bill format</u> returned by LSO to OSBE for review and final changes.
Dec	-SBOE review and approves the annual updated/revision to the strategic plan for the next FY.	-SBOE/OSBE approves performance measures for the Board and OSBE strategic plan including those based on the review of self-assessments.			- <u>Early-December</u> is the final date for changes to legislative proposals. Bills with substantive changes are resubmitted to SBOE for approval.

**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008**

**CY2009-2013 State Board of Education Strategic Planning/Performance
Budgeting Worksheet**

<u>Month</u>	<u>Strategic Planning</u>	<u>Performance Reporting</u>	<u>Eight-year Academic Programs Plan (semi-annual cycle)</u>	<u>Budgeting</u>	<u>Proposed Legislation</u>
Jan	-Agencies and Institutions start updating their strategic based on SBOE guidance and strategic plan.	-The SBOE reviews NWCCU accreditation results as available.	-Higher Education institutions hold regional meetings and begin drafting a regional plan for academic and professional-technical program offerings over the next 8 years.		
Feb	-Agencies and Institutions continue updating their strategic plans.		- Institutions continue to cooperatively draft regional plans.		
Mar	-Agencies and Institutions finalize their strategic plan updates for submission to the SBOE prior to <u>April</u> agenda cutoff.	-Institutions and agencies revise performance measures and benchmarks to align with strategic plan.	-Institutions (all regions) meet to conduct a statewide needs assessment for academic and professional-technical program offerings over the next 8 years.		
Apr	-SBOE is briefed on next FY legislative appropriations and new legislation as it impacts SBOE governed agencies and institutions. -SBOE reviews and approves SBOE strategic plan (revised format and a new year added). -SBOE receives final DFM strategic plan guidance (for governed agencies and institutions).	<u>-Early-April</u> agencies and institutions submit <u>proposed</u> performance measures/benchmarks (including continued use of current measures, if appropriate) for review/approval by SBOE. -SBOE/OSBE receives final DFM performance reporting guidance (for governed agencies and institutions). -SBOE reviews and approves agency and institution <u>proposed</u> performance measures and benchmarks.	-Institutions share their respective draft 8 year plans with OSBE and the other institutions.	-SBOE is briefed on next FY legislative appropriations and new legislation as it impacts SBOE governed agencies and institutions. -SBOE provides <u>budget guidelines</u> (including <u>line items</u>) to the agencies and institutions.	
May	-Presidents and agency head evaluations.			-Agencies and institutions submit estimated <u>line items</u> to OSBE prior to <u>June</u> Board agenda cutoff.	-Agencies and institutions notified to submit legislative

**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008**

				-Institutions and agencies submit 8 year strategic operation plans (all funds) to OSBE prior to the cutoff for <u>June</u> Board meeting agenda. 4-year institutions will also submit 8 year capital facilities and 8 year debt plans.	ideas and suggestions to OSBE prior to <u>June</u> Board agenda cutoff.
Jun	-SBOE reviews and approves updated agency and institution strategic plans.		-Institutions meet to formally present their 8 year plans.	-SBOE provides <u>budget MCO guidelines</u> to the agencies and institutions. -OSBE provides guidelines and budget template to agencies and institutions for MCO submission (prior to <u>August</u> Board agenda cutoff). -SBOE reviews agency and institution <u>line item</u> requests. -SBOE reviews and approves 8 year strategic operating, capital facilities and debt plans.	-SBOE reviews, approves and provides guidance concerning <u>proposed</u> agency and institution legislative ideas.
Jul	-OSBE submits SBOE approved agency and institution strategic plans (revised if required by the Board) to DFM by the <u>early-July</u> deadline.	-The SBOE reviews NWCCU accreditation results as available.	-Institutions meet to coordinate and finalize their 8 year plans for presentation to the Board in <u>August</u> . -OSBE staff verifies 8 year plans are compatible with institution role and mission, SBOE strategic plan and performance reporting.	-Agencies and institutions submit estimated MCO to OSBE prior to <u>August</u> Board agenda cutoff.	
Aug		-Agencies and institutions submit agency and institution performance reports to OSBE in <u>late-August</u> .	-Final 8 year plan for academic and professional-technical program offerings presented to the Board for approval.	-SBOE reviews and approves <u>final</u> budget request for next FY. -Draft budget request input to DFM automated system (by agencies and institutions) with a copy of supporting materials sent to	-OSBE submits legislative ideas to DFM prior to the required <u>early-August</u> deadline. -Governor's Office and

**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008**

				OSBE. -OSBE reviews agency and institution budget submissions to ensure compliance with SBOE guidance. -In late-August all budget documents returned to OSBE for final submission to DFM and LSO.	DFM review legislative ideas. -OSBE begins development of approved legislative ideas into draft legislation (as appropriate).
Sep	SBOE conducts a self-assessment.	-OSBE submits approved agency and institution performance reports to DFM by the required <u>early-September</u> deadline.		-Final budget requests forwarded to DFM and LSO by the <u>early-September</u> deadline.	-Proposed (final draft) legislation is due to DFM about <u>mid-September</u> .
Oct	-SBOE review Board's draft strategic plan. -SBOE reviews self-assessment and makes recommendations for improvements.	-SBOE reviews previous year performance data from institutions and agencies. Review forms the basis for revising the strategic plan.		-SBOE strategic planning summit includes financial outlook and impact of the zero-based budgeting initiative.	-Proposed legislation is approved by the SBOE. DFM forwards to LSO by <u>mid-October</u> .
Nov	-Staff develops and finalizes (in collaboration with the agencies and institutions) the next annual update to the strategic plan.	-OSBE updates performance measures to align with the Board's strategic plan.			-Proposed legislation in <u>bill format</u> returned by LSO to OSBE for review and final changes.
Dec	-SBOE review and approves the annual updated/revision to the strategic plan for the next FY.	-SBOE/OSBE approves performance measures for the Board and OSBE strategic plan including those based on the review of self-assessments.			- <u>Early-December</u> is the final date for changes to legislative proposals. Bills with substantive changes are resubmitted to SBOE for approval.

Idaho State Board of Education

GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SECTION: I. GENERAL GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SUBSECTION: M. Annual Planning and Reporting

August 2006

M. Annual Planning and Reporting

1. Strategic Plans

- a. Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College, University of Idaho, North Idaho College, College of Southern Idaho, Eastern Idaho Technical College, Division of Professional-Technical Education, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Idaho Educational Public Broadcasting System, and the School for the Deaf and the Blind will develop and maintain five-year strategic plans.

- (1) Institution, school and agency strategic plans shall be aligned with the Board's strategic plan, be created in accordance with Board guidelines, and be consistent with assigned role and mission statements.

- (2) Plans shall be updated annually and submitted to the Board for approval.

- (3) Plans shall be submitted by the Board to the appropriate state administrative entity in order to meet the state's annual planning requirements.

- b. The Idaho State Historical Society and Idaho Commission for Libraries are recognized as unique collaborators in the state education system and are encouraged to report annually to the Board in accordance with these guidelines.

- c. **Format**

Plans submitted to the Board annually should be as concise as possible and in accordance with a schedule and format established by the executive director.

Plans should contain:

- (1) A comprehensive mission and vision statement covering the major programs, functions and activities of the organization.

- (2) General goals and objectives for the major programs, functions and activities of the organization, including a description of how they are to be achieved.

- (a) Institutions (including Professional-Technical Education) and the School for the Deaf and the Blind should address, at a minimum, instructional issues (including accreditation and student issues), infrastructure issues (including personnel, finance, and facilities), advancement (including

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

foundation activities), and the external environment served by the institution.

- (b) Agencies should address, at a minimum, constituent issues and service delivery, infrastructure issues (including personnel, finance, and facilities), and advancement (if applicable).
- (3) Identification of key factors external to the organization that could significantly affect the achievement of the general goals and objectives.
- (4) A brief description of the evaluations or processes to be used in establishing or revising general goals and objectives in the future.

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

SUBJECT

Board Self-Evaluation Review

REFERENCE

May, 2006

The Board last conducted a self evaluation in the spring of 2006. This evaluation was reviewed in August of 2006. The Board agreed at that time to conduct an annual self evaluation.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.M.1.

BACKGROUND

Regular evaluations are critical to the success of any effective organization. The Board has conducted self-evaluations in the past and process improvements were made as a result. Board self-evaluations are also a required part of the institutional accreditation process.

DISCUSSION

The self-evaluation contains ratings and comments from Board members about internal processes and procedures.

IMPACT

Consensus around and implementation of procedural improvements will help the Board function more efficiently and effectively.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Self Evaluation Summary

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Board review and discuss the summary findings of the self-evaluation and develop recommendations for improvements.

BOARD ACTION

This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

Idaho State Board of Education Self-Evaluation Summary
March 2008

This self-assessment survey was developed to fulfill the need for the Board to evaluate its own performance in providing oversight and governance of the various agencies and institutions prescribed in the Idaho Constitution and Idaho Code. The self-assessment critical to the Board Strategic Planning process and to meet, in part, requirements defined in the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) accreditation standards.

1. My understanding of the roles and missions of all Board governed agencies and institutions is:

(1) Good (5) **Adequate** ___ Lacking

List one thing most needed most to improve your understanding of agencies and institutions:

- *Time and availability of information.*
- *More time. I've only been on the Board a little over a year.*
- *A short summary of the role and mission of each institution.*
- *A simple spreadsheet listing all the agencies/institutions and their respective roles and missions would be a handy document and useful for comparing and contrasting at any time. We could use this reference when we review their updated strategic plans on an annual basis.*
- *A presentation by SBOE Director on the Roles and missions of all such Board Agencies and institutions.*

2. In my opinion, the Board has performed its oversight and governing responsibilities:

(1) Well (3) **Satisfactorily** (2) Needs improvement

List two things that would most improve Board oversight and governance:

- *A refresher course on the Board's By-Laws and statutory authority.*
- *We need to make our May retreat a more productive work session- during which we review how we perform our responsibilities- both collectively and individually. Perhaps we should have a workshop on governance. How about John Carver?*
- *The Executive committee needs to meet regularly to streamline our program of work. There needs to be better communication from the Board office between Board meetings.*
- *Better understanding of internal budgets.*
- *Better understanding of board staff rules and responsibility.*
- *Good lines of communication.*
- *Performance measure relating to financial and efficiency achievement needs to be established with each institution.*
- *Better communication with all board members.*
- *More involvement of the executive committee.*

**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008**

3. When asked to vote on action items with significant policy/budget implications, I feel:

(2) Well Informed and prepared (4) **Often wish I had more knowledge/understanding**

List two things that would most improve your level of comfort in making important policy decisions:

- *Better cost/ benefit analysis.*
- *Impact if any on the Board's strategic plan.*
- *For awhile, Board staff provided Board members with a review of agenda items prior to Board meetings which was particularly helpful in preparing me to act on policy/budget issues. Currently, I have a conference call with Board staff on IRSA items before each meeting- tremendously helpful- but I would benefit from a similar briefing on other areas of the agenda.*
- *Receiving agenda items earlier.*
- *More staff background information.*
- *I need to spend more time reviewing the information that is being provided.*
- *Having the information sooner would help.*
- *We have plenty of information but it isn't well distilled to important points. The "executive summary" approach would help. We tend to spend too much time on issues of minor importance.*
- *More time to review the agenda.*
- *Better communication.*

4. As an individual Board member my views and opinions are important to other Board members:

(2) Almost always (4) **usually** ___ Often not

List one thing that would most improve interaction among Board members:

- *Consistent use of proper rules to run the meeting.*
- *We've had recent training on open meeting laws, perhaps we could use a refresher course on Robert's Rules of Order – I think Board members often have different interpretations of Parliamentary Procedure and use their interpretation to influence discussion.*
- *Opportunity for more dialogue with other board members.*
- *It would be helpful if we spent some time "visioning". There is little time to just discuss important issues of governance and direction.*
- *Better communication of involvement of more board members.*

5. The level of support provided by the Board staff to me as a Board member is:

(2) Good (3) **Adequate** (1) Needs improvement

List two things that would most improve the level of support provided by the Board staff:

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

- *More interaction between staff and board members.*
- *Fostering mutual respect.*
- *This is not meant to be negative, I just think we could all communicate better.*
- *I would like to be made aware of any K-12 issue before it goes before the board.*
- *Monthly updates.*
- *Clear understanding of staff of what the Board's authority is – which the Board needs to clarify for staff.*
- *Staff should not assume Board knows the steps taken to reach the staff recommendations.*
- *Clearly, we are understaffed, so support will improve when key posts are filled.*
- *I would like an updated organization chart with names and brief job descriptions – sometimes I don't know who to go to for what.*
- *Timely response to emails/messages/requests is always appreciated.*

6. The Board agenda materials for Board meetings are:

(4) **Good** (2) Adequate ___Need improvement

List two things that would most improve the Board meeting agenda/materials:

- *Better cost/benefit analysis.*
- *Tie in with Board's strategic plan and statutory authority.*
- *Getting our Agenda on CDs was a good move. Seems like we're getting the agenda earlier, too – which is appreciated. I rely heavily on Staff comments.*
- *I'm glad we're returning to meeting agendas that begin with Executive Session the night before and then starting first thing the next day with the Public meeting – better for travel coordination and a better time predictor for presenters.*
- *Just need more time to review them.*
- *Having it sooner would help.*
- *I think we have made good progress but still need to refine the meeting packet. The basic elements of the question and the rationale for approval/disapproval in a summary manner.*
- *Satisfied.*

7. The coordination between the Governor's Office and the Board is:

___Good (2) Adequate (3) **Needs improvement**

List one thing that would most improve coordination with the Governor's office:

- *More consistent communication.*
- *Communication with the Governor's office should go through the Director and President only. We get too many mixed messages.*
- *More regular meetings with the Governor and the Board.*

**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008**

- *Usually unaware of most coordination until after the fact.*
- *I feel like we get mixed messages from the Governor's office – or else those messages are ever changing. I'd like to know who meets with the "Governors Office" (and what constitutes the "Governor's Office"), when these meetings occur (are they regularly scheduled?), typically who sets the agendas for these meetings, and then, if appropriate be given some sort of briefing (via email?).*
- *Until the last few months, this area was a major problem. Should be sure no-one individual presents a barrier between the Governor and Board members. This needs to be done to avoid problems that have recently been addressed.*

8. The coordination between the Legislature and the Board is:

___ Good ___ Adequate (5) **Needs improvement**

List one thing that would most improve coordination with the Legislature:

- *We should invite members of both Education Committees to our Board meetings. Perhaps the Board President and Executive Director should meet regularly with the Chairs of the House and Senate Education Committees.*
- *It would be helpful to me to have a "Legislative Spreadsheet" that identifies pertinent education bills – what they are, where they came from (Board? Legislator?), current status. If this could be updated and emailed to me on a regular basis, I would use it.*
- *Both sides need to clearly understand what the Boards authority is and what it isn't and how that authority is exercised.*
- *Usually unaware of most coordination until after the fact.*
- *More regular meetings between the Board and the Senate and House Education Committees.*
- *More consistent communication.*

9. My understanding of the Board's responsibility in meeting accreditation standards of our institutions is:

(2) Good ___ Adequate (4) **Needs improvement**

List one thing that would most improve your understanding of the Board's role in accreditation:

- *I would benefit by a clearer understanding of the Accreditation process for our institutions and the important role the Board plays. Could we have a presentation on this???*
- *A stronger role in the process.*
- *I need a better understanding of the process of accreditation.*
- *A concise statement from NWCCU of what they expect of the Board.*
- *Continued interaction with NWCCU.*

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

10. My involvement in the NWCCU accreditation process has been:

(1) Extensive (3) Limited (2) None

List one approach for involving the Board in the accreditation process of our institutions:

- *I am not familiar enough with the process to respond.*
- *Communication and education.*
- *Being involved up front.*
- *All Board members need to participate in the on campus interviews.*
- *As Board members, we must make it a priority to participate in the Accreditation process for each of our institutions – which will require preparation in advance. We need to be fully invested in the accreditation process! We need to be prepared for and present during accreditation reviews.*

11. Is the Board Office organized in a manner best suited to support the Board?

(4) Yes (2) No

List two suggestions for better organizing the Board Office:

- *Again, I would like to see an Org Chart along with job descriptions.*
- *We should “staff up” according to the priorities/responsibilities of the Board. This will require us – as Board members – to identify our own priorities.*
- *Fill all necessary positions.*
- *Provide flow-chart of authority to Board.*
- *Full staffing.*
- *The structure is fine. Our problem is we need to fill key positions.*
- *Rebuild staff.*
- *Consistency in management.*
- *Identify redundancies between the Board and the Department of Education and eliminate them.*
- *More clearly define roles and responsibilities of staff members.*

12. With good staff support, the Board is able to provide governance and oversight of all agencies and institutions as prescribed in the Idaho Constitution and Code:

(2) Well (4) Adequately ____ The task is too great

- *Based on staff being able to provide good support under the current staffing limitations, is this possible?*

13. The Board is appropriately engaged in policy, oversight and management activities?

(2) Yes (1) No

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

List two ways the Board should change its role in policy, oversight and management activities:

- *We need to have a firm grip on our “calendar of work” – i.e. our timeline of when decisions/plans need to occur. Ex- budget development, legislative preparation/deadlines, etc.*
- *The Executive committee needs to meet regularly with the Executive Director to be apprised of issues that need to come before the Board, management issues, program of work, etc.*
- *Board members and Board need to move away from day to day management.*
- *Board must be more policy driven and not management driven.*
- *Return some responsibilities and oversight to State Department of Education. Work closer with State Department of Education.*
- *The process we are currently going through to realign K-12 responsibilities will help.*
- *Need more detailed review of board expenditures.*

Please list below your recommendations for continuing improvement in Board performance (not otherwise provided above).

1. *Historically, I think there have been tendencies for influential board members to act unilaterally and for staff to, therefore, react to singular directives rather than direction from the full board. I believe this was the reason for the problem with the recent DRC contract.*
2. *I think we need to acknowledge the positive things that are happening among our institutions and agencies at the start of every meeting. Add an agenda item called “Commendations” or even “Announcements.” All too often we get mired down in negative issues and forget to celebrate the good things that are happening. As an example, it was unforgivable that we didn’t acknowledge the U of I receiving the National Medal of Arts for over 3 months. We’re quick to celebrate athletic accomplishments! I know our agenda is full, but this doesn’t need to take long – it shows we’re paying attention to what’s happening among our agencies and institutions and might help set a positive tone for meetings.*
3. *Communication between the Governor and the Board is essential. Remove any barriers. Then be in the appropriate legislative committees with at least an annual report of the positive activities of the Board. Continued pro-active news articles and guest opinions on Board activities.*
4. *I am concerned about the amount of time we spend on things that are not material to the general performance and direction of the units we govern. I fear that too much time is spent on things that when you add it all up “gets lost in the rounding”.*

The steps we (Board Chairman, Governor, Board Members and myself) are currently taking will greatly improve the effectiveness of the Board. We are on the right path.

Idaho State Board of Education

GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SECTION: I. GENERAL GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SUBSECTION: M. Annual Planning and Reporting

August 2006

M. Annual Planning and Reporting

1. Strategic Plans

- a. Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College, University of Idaho, North Idaho College, College of Southern Idaho, Eastern Idaho Technical College, Division of Professional-Technical Education, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Idaho Educational Public Broadcasting System, and the School for the Deaf and the Blind will develop and maintain five-year strategic plans.

- (1) Institution, school and agency strategic plans shall be aligned with the Board's strategic plan, be created in accordance with Board guidelines, and be consistent with assigned role and mission statements.

- (2) Plans shall be updated annually and submitted to the Board for approval.

- (3) Plans shall be submitted by the Board to the appropriate state administrative entity in order to meet the state's annual planning requirements.

- b. The Idaho State Historical Society and Idaho Commission for Libraries are recognized as unique collaborators in the state education system and are encouraged to report annually to the Board in accordance with these guidelines.

- c. **Format**

Plans submitted to the Board annually should be as concise as possible and in accordance with a schedule and format established by the executive director.

Plans should contain:

- (1) A comprehensive mission and vision statement covering the major programs, functions and activities of the organization.

- (2) General goals and objectives for the major programs, functions and activities of the organization, including a description of how they are to be achieved.

- (a) Institutions (including Professional-Technical Education) and the School for the Deaf and the Blind should address, at a minimum, instructional issues (including accreditation and student issues), infrastructure issues (including personnel, finance, and facilities), advancement (including

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARCH 27, 2008

foundation activities), and the external environment served by the institution.

- (b) Agencies should address, at a minimum, constituent issues and service delivery, infrastructure issues (including personnel, finance, and facilities), and advancement (if applicable).
- (3) Identification of key factors external to the organization that could significantly affect the achievement of the general goals and objectives.
- (4) A brief description of the evaluations or processes to be used in establishing or revising general goals and objectives in the future.

